

1 REMARKS

2 Status of the Claims

3 Claims 1-24, 29-31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39 and 40 are now pending in the present application,  
4 Claims 25-27, 28, 32, 35, 38, and 41-44 having been previously canceled, and Claims 45-48 having been  
5 canceled herein. Claims 1, 8, 16, 29, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, and 40 have been amended to more clearly  
6 define the subject matter being claimed.

7 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, Second Paragraph

8 The Examiner has rejected Claims 45-48 as being indefinite, because each claim refers to two  
9 images, and the claims do not specify for which of the images the spatial frequency content data is  
10 calculated.

11 Claims 45-48 have been canceled, because the subject matter of such claims has been introduced  
12 into the independent claims to distinguish over the art. Care has been taken to ensure the indefiniteness  
13 issue the Examiner has identified has been addressed in the amendment to the independent claims (i.e.,  
14 the claims as amended specify the image being processed to determine the spatial frequency content data).

15 The Examiner has correctly noted that Claim 48 was identical to Claim 45. Claim 48 should have  
16 been dependent upon Claim 29, not Claim 1 (such that Claim 45 was dependent upon independent  
17 Claim 1, Claim 46 was dependent upon independent Claim 8, Claim 47 was dependent upon independent  
18 Claim 16, and Claim 48 was dependent upon independent Claim 29).

19 Claims Rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

20 Claims 1-26, 29-31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
21 unpatentable over various combinations of references, including U.S. Patent Publication No.  
22 2002/0071121 (Ortyn), U.S. Patent No. 6,211,955 (Basiji), a publication by Young et al. (*Towards*  
23 *automatic cell identification in DIC microscopy*), and a publication by Nicoletti (*Common Methods for*  
24 *Measuring Apoptotic Cell Death in Flow Cytometry*).

25 The Examiner has noted that Claims 45-47, each of which depend upon a different independent  
26 claim, recite patentable subject matter. Applicants have amended independent Claim 1 based on  
27 Claim 45, independent Claim 8 based on Claim 46, and independent Claim 16 based on Claim 47. Such  
28 amendments essentially rewrite the objected to claims in independent form, thus Claims 1, 8 and 16  
29 appear to be allowable over the prior art.

1 The Examiner further objected to dependent Claim 48, which is identical to dependent Claim 45.  
2 Applicants had intended dependent Claim 48 to depend from independent Claim 29, such that the novel  
3 technique for determining spatial frequency content data from an image was recited in a dependent claim  
4 related to each of independent Claims 1, 8, 16 and 29.

5 The novel subject matter of dependent Claim 48 has been incorporated into independent  
6 Claim 29, thus it appears that each independent claim as amended herein distinguishes over the art.

7 In consideration of the amendment to the claims and the Remarks set forth above, it is applicants'  
8 position that all claims in the current application are patentable over the art of record. The Examiner is  
9 thus requested to pass this case to issue without further delay. In the event that any other issues remain,  
10 the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

11  
12 Respectfully submitted,

13  
14  
15 /mike king/  
16 Michael C. King  
17 Registration No. 44,832

18 MCK/RMA:elm  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30